



# The impact of data precision on the effectiveness of alien plant control programmes: a case study from a protected area

Chad Cheney  · Karen J. Esler  · Llewellyn C. Foxcroft  · Nicola J. van Wilgen  ·  
Melodie A. McGeoch 

Received: 30 January 2018 / Accepted: 27 May 2018 / Published online: 13 June 2018  
© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018

**Abstract** Successful long-term invasive alien plant control programmes rely on alien plant distribution and abundance data to assess, prioritise, implement and monitor the efficacy of the programme. Here we assess the impact of data accuracy using the alien plant programme in Table Mountain National Park, South Africa. A systematic plot-based survey method was carried out to assess the distribution of alien plants in the park at a fine scale (systematic sampling). Alien plant richness, total area invaded and the degree of spatial overlap in species' presence were compared between the systematic sample and a protected area (PA) managers' dataset (collated from collective observations by park visitors, rangers and managers) and Working for Water (WfW) project data (data

collected for the planning and implementation of the alien plant clearing programme) using a range of confusion matrix-based statistics to assess similarity and error rates between the datasets. A total of 106 alien plant taxa were detected across the three datasets, 12 in PA manager's data, 23 in WfW data and 101 in the systematic survey. Overall, there was substantive disagreement between the datasets on the distribution of alien plants. For example both management datasets estimated species' hectare coverage at orders of magnitude greater than indicated by systematic sampling. The inaccuracy of manager data has direct negative implications for funding allocation, which currently appears to be in excess of what is required. We recommend that contrary to perception, fine-scale surveys are a cost-effective way to inform long-term monitoring programmes and improve programme effectiveness.

**Electronic supplementary material** The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-018-1770-8>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

C. Cheney (✉) · N. J. van Wilgen  
South African National Parks, PO Box 37, Steenberg,  
Cape Town 7947, South Africa  
e-mail: Chad.Cheney@sanparks.org

K. J. Esler  
Department of Conservation Ecology and Entomology,  
Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1, Matieland,  
Stellenbosch 7602, South Africa

L. C. Foxcroft  
Conservation Services, South African National Parks,  
Private Bag X402, Skukuza 1350, South Africa

C. Cheney · K. J. Esler · L. C. Foxcroft ·  
N. J. van Wilgen · M. A. McGeoch  
Centre for Invasion Biology, Department of Botany and  
Zoology, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1,  
Matieland, Stellenbosch 7602, South Africa

M. A. McGeoch  
School of Biological Sciences, Monash University,  
Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia

**Keywords** Control programme · Confusion matrix · Invasive species · Protected area management · Systematic distribution sampling

## Introduction

Protected areas (PAs) have been established as part of a core approach to biodiversity conservation and the maintenance of functional ecosystem processes (Barr et al. 2016; Dudley and Parish 2006; Watson et al. 2014). PAs are complex ecological systems and PA managers require high quality and up-to-date information to effectively manage these areas for their intended conservation mandates and objectives (Biggs et al. 2003; Pressey et al. 2015). One of the primary threats to biodiversity in PAs is the invasion and persistence of invasive alien plants (Foxcroft et al. 2013a, b; Spear et al. 2011). For example, invasive alien plants can change community structure (Holmes and Cowling 1997), alter energy, nutrient and water flows (Ehrenfeld 2010; Le Maitre et al. 2002) and modify disturbance regimes, especially fire (Alba et al. 2015; Brooks et al. 2004). In most cases, once an invasive alien plant has established, it cannot be removed unless through large control efforts or only at substantial cost (Foxcroft et al. 2013a; McConnachie et al. 2012; van Wilgen et al. 2012b), resulting in permanent effects on native biodiversity (Kettenring and Adams 2011).

There are many potential pathways by which alien and invasive alien plants can be introduced into PAs (Foxcroft et al. 2008). PAs have to contend with a legacy of deliberate alien species introductions prior to PA proclamation or as part of the current management practices of a PA in the form of forestry plantation or at tourism facilities (Kueffer et al. 2013). Protected area managers are therefore required to continually detect, control or eradicate a range of existing alien plants, and develop strategies to prevent or appropriately respond to the arrival of new alien species that could exacerbate current threats (Pyšek and Richardson 2010).

An invasive alien plant control programme typically comprises a set of actions to achieve objectives that are guided by the strategic aims or goals of the programme (Foxcroft 2009; Tu 2009; Wittenberg and Cock 2001). To implement an effective control programme, PA managers need to consider the

achievability of specific objectives, goals and outcomes. Often compromises and prioritization of objectives and goals are required due to constraints on time, financial and other resources, lost opportunity costs and conflicting priorities (Donlan et al. 2015; Roura-Pascual et al. 2011; Roura-Pascual et al. 2009). However, the type and quality of information used to guide prioritization, decision-making and monitoring is an integral, yet often overlooked, component of control programmes (Foxcroft 2009; Gardener et al. 2010; McConnachie et al. 2012; van Wilgen et al. 2012b).

South Africa has a long history of invasion by alien plant species, driven by a range of complex global, local, social and ecological interactions (Le Maitre et al. 2004). Many introduced species are well-established and substantial negative impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services have been documented (Kotzé et al. 2010; Nel et al. 2004). ‘Working for Water’ (WfW) is a nationally funded invasive alien control programme that aims to restore and maintain habitat structure and function to mitigate the loss of ecosystem services, especially water production through creating employment opportunities and facilitating skills development that contribute to poverty alleviation (van Wilgen et al. 2012a).

WfW has historically invested (1995–2015) approximately ZAR 564 million (1 US\$ ~ 15 ZAR in 2015) in South Africa’s PAs (van Wilgen et al. 2012a, 2016). Despite the substantive investment in the programme, annual estimates of the clearing work required remain high, necessitating sustained large or increasing budgets. In PAs, the WfW programme is implemented through projects undertaken as partnerships between PA managers and WfW project teams. For PA clearing projects to be efficient, data on alien plant species richness (McGeoch et al. 2012), the distribution of target species across the entire treatment area (Gardener et al. 2010; Pyšek and Richardson 2010; Wittenberg and Cock 2001), and a measure of the abundance of the populations are required (Dewey and Andersen 2004). Given the fundamental importance of spatial data for alien plant management, a variety of methods of data collection have been developed and are currently being implemented in the WfW alien control programme. However, there has been no assessment of the best approach for data collection or the effects the various collection methods have. Given the large monetary investment, it is

important to determine the role and effectiveness of various types of data in informing alien plant management programme efficacy.

Here, Table Mountain National Park (TMNP) is used as a case study to quantify the adequacy of datasets used in PAs for the management of invasive alien plants. Alien plant species richness, distribution and abundance data from three sources, (i) WfW project managers, (ii) invasions recorded by PA managers and (iii) a fine-scale, in-field systematic survey of alien plant species, were assessed. The assessment aimed to determine the relative error in estimates of the extent of invasion across TMNP from each of the different data sources and the possible role of this information in misinforming management plans and reducing clearing efficiency. The implications of discrepancies between the datasets are discussed and recommendations provided to improve data collection methods and the evidence base used for alien plant species management.

## Materials and methods

### Study area

The Cape Peninsula, on the south western tip of South Africa, is a mountainous, topographically diverse area, generally nutrient poor soils, with high levels of species endemism of both plants and invertebrates (Cowling et al. 1996). About 2285 plant species have been recorded, with 158 species being endemic (Helme and Trinder-Smith 2006). The Cape Peninsula has experienced a long history of human settlement with the establishment of the City of Cape Town, which has a population of over 3.7 million people (Statistics South Africa 2011). The TMNP was established within the urban matrix in 1998 to consolidate the management of remaining conservation-worthy land on the Cape Peninsula and currently covers about 250 km<sup>2</sup>. For over a century the historical land-use and proximity to urbanization has facilitated the introduction and spread of numerous alien plant species into TMNP (Alston and Richardson 2006; Macdonald et al. 1985; Shaughnessy 1980; Spear et al. 2013).

The TMNP has an intensive long-term alien plant clearing programme in place that is currently implemented through the WfW Programme, and was

previously implemented as part of the management function of the PA, employing semi-skilled labour, skilled private contractors and civil society volunteer groups (Macdonald et al. 1985). The current alien plant clearing programme is divided into three operational projects covering the northern, central and southern sections of TMNP. This study focused on the southern section of the PA which is the largest in both area, covering approximately 130 km<sup>2</sup>, and in funding allocated for alien plant control, which was ZAR R8.7 million for the 2013 financial year (Working for Water 2013). This section of TMNP has a history of woody alien plant species invasion spanning at least 70 years and has had management control programmes in place since the late 1980s (Macdonald et al. 1985; Taylor and Macdonald 1985; Taylor et al. 1985). Despite these programmes, annual estimates of the clearing work required remain high, necessitating sustained large budgets.

### Alien plant management datasets

The implementation of the TMNP alien plant management programme is based on data from two main sources: data collated by the PA managers who maintain records of alien species reported by park rangers and park visitors (hereafter the 'Management' data) and WfW project information, which includes a database of spatially linked historic clearing information (hereafter 'WfW' data). We generated a third dataset using a fine-scale systematic sampling approach to map the richness, distribution and density of all alien species in TMNP (hereafter the 'Systematic' data).

#### *PA managers dataset—'management dataset'*

Protected area managers are collectively responsible for implementing the daily operations of the park. While the implementation of alien plant control in the PA is undertaken by WfW (see below), the PA managers and rangers collect and collate their own alien plant occurrence data. The dataset is maintained largely as a paper-based file consisting of area maps where historical records, reports from park visitors and personal observations are recorded on an ad hoc basis. At a group workshop in 2013, 11 managers from the park, were asked to consolidate the distribution records from this dataset and to add expert knowledge to these

distribution maps for all alien plant species that were common, or considered important for direct control or monitoring. The distribution of the alien plant species was delineated on a colour aerial map (scale 1:20,000) divided into the 0.70 km<sup>2</sup> polygons used for conservation management purposes. Where required, these management units were sub-divided to allow for finer-scale delineation per alien plant species or abundance variations. Protected area managers used three measures to estimate alien species abundance, resulting in a combination of percentage cover, density per hectare and descriptive measures (Supplementary material 1: Table 1). The final map was divided into 297 polygons that ranged in size from a relatively fine grain of 0.02 km<sup>2</sup> to a coarse grain of 0.71 km<sup>2</sup> (mean of 0.44 km<sup>2</sup>), covering a total area of 130.75 km<sup>2</sup>. The data were captured in ArcGIS 10.x (ESRI 2014) (Fig. 1a).

#### *Working for water dataset—‘WfW dataset’*

Working for Water managers rely on a database of alien distribution information known as WIMS (Working for Water Information Management System) to guide the programmes’ implementation. A key component of the WIMS system is the development of an annual plan of operations (APO). These APOs contain a detailed list of all alien plant species and their percentage cover that occur within a project area for a particular year. The project area is further divided into management clearing units known as nBals (National Biological Alien data). The alien species composition and cover for each nBal is updated annually through a combination of in-field visual assessments and rapid plot-based assessments. The WfW dataset for the area comprised 182 nBals which ranged from a relatively fine grain of 0.02 km<sup>2</sup> to a very coarse grain of 12.57 km<sup>2</sup> (mean of 0.71 km<sup>2</sup>) and covered a total area of 125.50 km<sup>2</sup> (Fig. 1b). Alien species distribution data (species presence and percentage cover; Supplementary material 1: Table 1) were obtained for each of these nBals for the 2013 project year.

#### *Systematic survey dataset—‘systematic dataset’*

A dedicated survey team systematically sampled the southern section of the PA between April and November 2013. The survey was designed by


overlaying the study area with a fine grain (0.02 km<sup>2</sup>) sampling grid. A 500 m<sup>2</sup> circular sampling plot was placed at the centre of each grid cell resulting in 5276 plots, evenly distributed across the study area. Within each plot all alien plant species were identified, and richness and abundance quantified. Where the number of individuals for a given species was less than 100, all individuals were counted; where the number of individuals was likely to exceed 100, three randomly placed sub-plots totalling 10 m<sup>2</sup> were sampled. All individuals within the sub-plots were counted and extrapolated by multiplying the mean to a full plot estimate. Where the growth form of the plants did not allow for individual counts (e.g. grasses and creepers), a percentage cover of the full plot was determined using six cover classes (Supplementary material 1: Table 1). All counts and cover estimates from each sample plot (0.0005 km<sup>2</sup>) were extrapolated to the size of the full 0.02 km<sup>2</sup> grid cell for analysis to provide for density estimates across the entire study area of 126.40 km<sup>2</sup>. (Fig. 1c).

#### *Dataset comparisons*

The three datasets had slightly different spatial extents and only the overlapping areas, which covered 125.15 km<sup>2</sup>, were included in analyses. These included 295 of the 297 Management polygons and 176 of the 182 WfW nBals. The Management and WfW datasets were compared to the Systematic data in terms of (i) the alien plant species richness, (ii) the degree of spatial overlap in alien plant species presence and (iii) the recorded abundance and area invaded by selected alien plant species.

#### *Species richness within datasets*

Species listed within each dataset were checked and verified for taxonomic accuracy and known presence (Spear et al. 2011). While most records contained species level information, some records were only identified to genus level (e.g. *Eucalyptus* spp.). For these cases, the records were grouped and treated as a single taxon (e.g. *Eucalyptus* spp.). The Systematic dataset included 12 extralimital species (i.e. a species native to South Africa but outside of its natural distribution range, e.g. *Afrocarpus falcatus* and *Aloe arborescens*) that were excluded from the analysis as they were not specifically recorded in the other



**Fig. 1** Maps depicting the size and distribution of the management/sampling units used **a** in the Protected Area Manager Dataset ( $n = 297$ ), **b** by Working for Water ( $n = 182$ ), and **c** for systematic sampling ( $n = 5276$ )

datasets. To determine the accumulation rates of alien plants within the three datasets, the mean species accumulation curves, with 95% confidence limits, were plotted based on 100 randomisations using Estimate-S v 9.1 (Colwell 2013). Although not directly comparable due to the different sizes of the individual sample units, the mean, minimum and maximum species richness was calculated for each dataset to allow for overall comparison of the data for the study area.

#### *Selection of taxa for comparison*

The datasets were checked for species that were common to all three datasets. All records belonging to *Hakea* spp., *Pinus* spp. and *Eucalyptus* spp. in the Management and the WfW datasets were not consistently identified to the species level within these genera and as such were analysed at genus level. The datasets had five species in common identified to

species level (*Acacia cyclops*, *Acacia longifolia*, *Acacia saligna*, *Leptospermum laevigatum* and *Paraserianthes lophantha*) which together provided eight taxa (species or genera) for comparative analysis. This selection included the taxa that are the primary focus of the alien plant control programme.

#### *Degree of spatial agreement in taxa presence/absence between datasets*

Taxa within each sampling unit were scored as present or absent. The degree of spatial matching in taxa presence was assessed between the Systematic data and (i) Management and (ii) WfW datasets. As the PA managers and WfW data are captured in large polygons (Fig. 1), the data from the small plots of the Systematic data that fell within the polygon were pooled for analysis. To determine which plots from the Systematic dataset fell within each polygon, a standard spatial query was performed in ArcGIS (10x).



The data were summarised as cross-tabulates where the Systematic data are regarded as the observed class and either the WfW or Management data the predicted class (Supplementary material 1: Table 2). The cross-tabulates were treated as a confusion-matrix (Fielding and Bell 1997) where *a* is the number of sampling units in which the taxa were recorded in both datasets (*true presence*), *b* where only the Management data or WfW dataset recorded the taxa (*false presence*), *c* where only the Systematic dataset recorded the taxa (*false absence*) and *d* where the taxa was not recorded in either dataset (*true absence*). A range of confusion matrix-based statistics (Accuracy, Prevalence, Sensitivity Specificity and Odds Ratio; see Supplementary material 1: Table 3 for definition and formulas) were used to assess the degree of similarity and error rates between the datasets (Fielding 2007; Fielding and Bell 1997). In addition two measures of classification accuracy, Kappa (K), and the True Skill Statistic (TSS) (Allouche et al. 2006) were calculated to determine the proportion of specific agreement between the Systematic data and WfW data, and the Systematic data and Management data.

#### *Total area invaded by taxa and baseline clearing costs*

For each dataset the total condensed area covered was calculated by multiplying the taxon percentage cover in each base mapping unit by the area of that mapped unit (Marais and Wannenburgh 2008), which then expresses the area invaded as an equivalent of 100% cover. Where Management data were expressed using a descriptive value, these abundance classes were converted to cover estimates by using the mid-value of the cover class (Supplementary material 1: Table 1). These mid-point cover estimates have the potential to over or under estimate the cover values and thus the total condensed area. The effect of this was minimised by having a narrow range of cover values available within a class (e.g. 1–10% for low density classes while for higher density sites the over or under estimate is limited by the small size of sample units (0.02–0.03 km<sup>2</sup>).

The WfW data are recorded as percentage cover per taxon and therefore these values were used as recorded. The Systematic data density counts were converted to cover values using the WfW Norms and Standards tables (Le Maitre and Versfeld 1994). Each sample unit from the Management dataset and WfW dataset was paired with the Systematic dataset and the

total condensed area calculated for the Systematic dataset. The differences between the datasets were tested using a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for paired samples, with the pairs being the sample units.


For each dataset the condensed areas were calculated for each taxon and for all taxa together to compare the estimated clearing costs that would be estimated from each dataset. Estimations were based on the WfW norms and standards of 24.65 person days per hectare (0.01 km<sup>2</sup>) required to clear adult alien plants at 100% cover (Neethling and Shuttleworth 2013) multiplied by the daily WfW programme's person-day cost of R250 per person per day. This cost is based only on the estimated density and abundance of species to be cleared. It does not consider additional costs incurred though, for example, transport, equipment or herbicide requirements, which vary according to site topography, species presence and distribution of species within the landscape.

## Results

### Alien plant species richness

A total of 106 alien plant taxa from 71 genera were recorded from all three datasets (Fig. 2, Supplementary Material 2). The most taxa (101 taxa, 95% of the total) were recorded through systematic sampling, followed by the WfW dataset (23 taxa, 22%). The Management dataset had the fewest taxa (12 taxa, 11%). The Management and WfW datasets comprised mainly woody species (9 out of 12, and 15 out of 23 taxa respectively), while woody species accounted for only 38 of the 101 taxa in the Systematic dataset. Only nine taxa (8% of the total) were recorded in all three datasets (Fig. 2).

The Systematic dataset had more species in common with the WfW data than the Management data, with 19 (including 14 woody species) of the 106 species in common, but 81 (76%) of the alien plant taxa in the systematic sampling dataset were not recorded in either the WfW or the Management data. The five species recorded in the WfW and Management datasets, but not in the Systematic dataset, comprised taxa only identified to genus level (e.g. *Pinus* sp. which were all identified to species level in the systematic sample) or *Metrosideros excelsa* which only had a single location record.



**Fig. 2** The number of alien taxa unique to and shared between the three datasets: Systematic sampling (101 taxa in total), WfW (23 taxa) and Management Data (12 taxa) with a total of 106 taxa across all datasets. See Supplementary material 2 for full

taxa list. Note: for the purposes of this figure data are scored as different between datasets where records are less specifically identified (e.g. *Hakea gibbosa* is different to *Hakea* spp.)

The rate that taxa were recorded within the datasets was greatest in the Systematic dataset (Fig. 3). After reaching a cumulative area of 2.5 km<sup>2</sup> there was no overlap in taxa richness between the Systematic dataset and either the WfW or Management datasets. The alien plant taxa accumulation curve approached an asymptote at approximately 10 km<sup>2</sup> (12% of the total study area) for the Management data, while the WfW dataset continued to accumulate taxa until 120 km<sup>2</sup> (95% of the study area) and the Systematic dataset did not reach an asymptote for the study area.


Degree of spatial agreement in taxa presence/absences between datasets

#### *Management and systematic dataset*

In the Management dataset, at least one alien taxon was recorded in each of the 295 polygons while the

Systematic dataset recorded at least one alien taxon in 266 of the 295 polygons (90%, Tables 1, 2). According to the Management dataset, *Acacia cyclops* and *Acacia saligna* were widespread in the study area (recorded in 282 and 285 of the 295 polygons respectively), while the Systematic dataset recorded these two species as being scattered in the study area (recorded in 195 and 198 of the 295 polygons respectively).

The overall agreement on alien plant spatial distribution for seven of the eight compared taxa was poor between the Systematic and Management datasets (Table 2), with the Kappa and TSS statistics less than 0.4, which is considered to be a minimum threshold designating good agreement (Landis and Koch 1977). Although there was agreement on spatial presence (sensitivity scores > 0.9; Table 2) for widespread taxa (e.g. *A. cyclops* and *A. saligna*), there was low agreement on absence (specificity scores = 0.06)



**Fig. 3** Mean alien plant taxa accumulation curves (100 randomisations) for the Management, Working for Water (WfW) and Systematic datasets plotted on a log scale (base 2; x-axis), with error bars indicating 95% confidence intervals as calculated with EstimateS (Colwell R.K., 2013)

for these taxa. Localised taxa (e.g. *Acacia longifolia*, *Leptospermum laevigatum*) showed opposite trends with high agreement of absence (specificity scores > 0.8; Table 2) and fair agreement of presence (sensitivity scores > 0.4; Table 2).

### WfW and systematic dataset

When comparing the WfW and Systematic datasets, at least one alien taxon was recorded in each of the 176 WfW sample units compared to 174 of the 176 WfW nBals for systematic data (Table 1 and Table 3). In the WfW dataset, only *A. saligna* was recorded as widespread, with *A. cyclops* and *A. longifolia* recorded as scattered within the study area and the remaining five taxa having localised distributions.

Overall, the agreement between the Systematic and WfW datasets for all eight compared taxa was very poor (Table 3), with the kappa and TSS statistics for all eight taxa lower than 0.4. The WfW dataset was similar to the Management dataset, where widespread species had agreement on presence (sensitivity scores > 0.9; Table 3), while the agreement on absence was variable (specificity scores 0.37–0.69; Table 3). For localised taxa, the WfW dataset recorded generally good agreement of absence (specificity scores > 0.8) while the agreement of presences was generally low (sensitivity scores < 0.25). Overall the dataset recorded a mismatch in the distribution of the taxa analysed.

Total invaded area by taxon and baseline clearing costs

In the Management dataset the total condensed area invaded by all alien plant taxa was 28.44 km<sup>2</sup>

**Table 1** Dataset summary for the Management, Working for Water (WfW) and the Systematic datasets

	Management	WfW	Systematic
Total extent of survey area	130.75 km <sup>2</sup>	125.50 km <sup>2</sup>	126.40 km <sup>2</sup>
Number of polygons	297	182	5276
Polygon size range	0.02–0.71 km <sup>2</sup> (mean 0.44 km <sup>2</sup> )	0.02–12.57 km <sup>2</sup> (mean of 0.71 km <sup>2</sup> )	0.02 km <sup>2</sup>
Taxa in dataset	Total: 12	Total: 23	Total: 101
Range of Taxa identified per polygon	Min: 1 Max: 7 Mean: 3.0 (SD = 1.40)	Min: 1 Max: 6 Mean: 2.2 (SD = 1.37)	Min: 0 Max: 16 Mean: 0.79 (SD = 1.51)
Number of polygons occupied by alien plants out of the total polygons for that dataset	297 (100%)	182 (100%)	2151 (41%)
Range occupied (all species)	130.75 km <sup>2</sup>	125.50 km <sup>2</sup>	43.02 km <sup>2</sup>
Time period collected	All records known by PA managers as at July 2013	January–March 2013	April–November 2013



**Table 2** Presence and absence of selected taxa recorded in the Systematic and Management datasets (n = 295)

Taxa	M + S + (a)	M + S – (b)	M – S+ (c)	M – S (d)	Accuracy	Prevalence	Sensitivity	Specificity	Odds Ratio	Kappa (K)	TSS
All taxa	266 90%	29 10%	0 0%	0 0%	0.90	0.90	1.00	0.00	NS	0.00	0.00
<i>Acacia cyclops</i>	188 64%	94 32%	7 2%	6 2%	0.66	0.66	0.96	0.06	1.71	0.03	0.02
<i>Acacia longifolia</i>	43 15%	38 13%	41 14%	173 58%	0.73	0.28	0.51	0.82	4.77	0.34	0.33
<i>Acacia saligna</i>	194 66%	91 31%	4 1%	6 2%	0.68	0.67	0.98	0.06	3.20	0.05	0.04
<i>Eucalyptus</i> spp.	9 3%	19 6%	21 7%	246 84%	0.86	0.10	0.30	0.93	5.55	0.24	0.23
<i>Hakea</i> spp.	0 0%	2 1%	37 12%	256 87%	0.87	0.13	0.00	0.99	0.00	– 0.01	– 0.01
<i>Leptospermum laevigatum</i>	15 5%	32 11%	20 7%	228 77%	0.82	0.12	0.43	0.88	5.34	0.27	0.31
<i>Paraserianthes lophantha</i>	19 6%	47 16%	27 9%	202 69%	0.75	0.16	0.41	0.81	3.02	0.19	0.22
<i>Pinus</i> spp.	55 19%	31 11%	30 10%	179 60%	0.79	0.29	0.65	0.85	10.59	0.50	0.50

S + indicates presence in the Systematic data; S – indicates absence in the Systematic data; M + denotes presence in the Management data and M – denotes an absence from the Management data, with the resulting confusion matrix measures (defined in Supplementary material 1: Table 3)

(equivalent to 22.7% of the study area; Table 4). This was significantly more than the total condensed area of 2.43 km<sup>2</sup> measured in the Systematic dataset (equivalent to 1.9% of the study area; Table 4;  $Z = -14.711$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $r = 0.606$ ). All taxa, both widespread species such as *A. cyclops*, *A. saligna*, and localised species such as *A. longifolia* and *Pinus* spp., showed marked, highly significant differences (Table 4;  $p < 0.001$ ) in total condensed area invaded, with the Management dataset consistently reporting higher condensed area across all taxa (Fig. 4).

The condensed area of all alien plants in the WfW data totalled 15.84 km<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to 12.6% of the study area), which despite being 45% less than the Management dataset, was still significantly greater than the condensed area recorded in the Systematic dataset ( $Z = -9.622$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $r = 0.513$ , Table 5). Like the Management dataset, the WfW data recorded widespread taxa such as *A. cyclops* and *A. saligna* as having significantly greater condensed areas ( $p < 0.001$ , Table 5) compared to the Systematic

data. The majority of localised taxa (e.g. *A. longifolia*, *L. laevigatum* and *Paraserianthes lophantha*) had similar condensed density estimates in the two datasets (Table 5; Fig. 4), but their spatial locations were poorly matched.

Overall there was a large discrepancy between the Systematic and WfW data in the estimated budget required to control all invasive alien plants. The Systematic data estimated a person day requirement of ZAR1.5 million while the WfW data produced a budget estimate of ZAR9.8 million (Fig. 5; recognizing that additional travel and treatment costs are not included in these estimates). The discrepancy in required person day budget to treat invasive alien plants was similar for individual taxa. For example, *A. saligna* in the Management dataset had a total condensed area of 10.78 km<sup>2</sup> and the WfW dataset had a total condensed area 12.85 km<sup>2</sup>, while the Systematic dataset recorded only 1.36 km<sup>2</sup> total condensed area (Tables 4 & 5). Cost estimates to treat *A. saligna* derived from the Management data

**Table 3** Presence and absence of selected taxa recorded in the Systematic and WfW datasets (n = 176)

Taxa	W + S + (a)	W + S – (b)	W – S + (c)	W – S – (d)	Accuracy	Prevalence	Sensitivity	Specificity	Odds ratio	Kappa (K)	TSS
All taxa	174 99%	2 1%	0 0%	0 0%	0.99	0.99	1.00	0.00	NS	0.00	0.00
<i>Acacia cyclops</i>	61 35%	19 11%	54 30%	42 24%	0.59	0.65	0.53	0.69	2.50	0.19	0.22
<i>Acacia longifolia</i>	24 13%	12 7%	61 35%	79 45%	0.59	0.48	0.28	0.87	2.59	0.15	0.15
<i>Acacia saligna</i>	142 81%	17 10%	7 4%	10 5%	0.86	0.85	0.95	0.37	11.93	0.38	0.32
<i>Eucalyptus</i> spp.	7 4%	10 5%	29 17%	130 74%	0.78	0.20	0.19	0.93	3.14	0.15	0.12
<i>Hakea</i> spp.	6 3%	5 3%	34 19%	131 75%	0.78	0.23	0.15	0.96	4.62	0.15	0.11
<i>Leptospermum laevigatum</i>	6 3%	8 5%	31 17%	131 75%	0.78	0.21	0.16	0.94	3.17	0.14	0.10
<i>Paraserianthes lophantha</i>	12 7%	16 9%	46 26%	102 58%	0.65	0.33	0.21	0.86	1.66	0.08	0.07
<i>Pinus</i> spp.	15 8%	7 4%	48 28%	106 60%	0.69	0.36	0.24	0.94	4.73	0.21	0.18

S + is presence in the Systematic data; S – is absence in the Systematic data; W + is presence in the WfW dataset and W – is the absence in the WfW dataset with the resulting confusion matrix measures (defined in Supplementary material 1: Table 3)

would be ZAR6.64 million and ZAR7.92 million from the WfW data (Fig. 5). A person day costing based on the Systematic data indicates that a reduced budget of ZAR0.84 million would be adequate to treat this species.

## Discussion

Understanding the inherent strengths and weaknesses in data that are used to inform decision making will influence the long-term outcomes and sustainability of invasive alien plant management programmes (Cook et al. 2009) as data accuracy has a direct effect on the quality of management decisions made for control programmes. Although the accuracy of data collection is consistently emphasised in invasive alien plant control programmes globally (McNaught et al. 2008; Rew and Pokorný 2006), these data do not often meet the specific needs for which they are collected (Cook et al. 2009) or are inappropriately applied to multiple objectives due to budget and time constraints.

However there are seldom multiple datasets available for PA managers to assess the extent to which data types and sources impact on achieving the desired outcome. In this study, the data compiled from three sources in TMNP allow for such detailed analysis.

The positive relationship between grain (size of the minimum mapping unit) and resultant species distribution (area of occupancy) (Foxcroft et al. 2009; McGeoch and Gaston 2002) was not properly considered in the Management and WfW datasets. While the datasets agreed on the occurrence of the most common invasive species at a landscape or PA scale (coarse grain), at a finer grain, the systematic sampling approach listed significantly more alien species, smaller distribution ranges of species and lower abundance of the common, wide-spread species. Not accounting for coarse grain of mapping when estimating area occupied by alien species has significant consequences for the management of alien species in terms of resource allocation and budget and can lead to the failure or delayed success of a control programme (Rejmánek and Pitcairn 2002; Wilson et al. 2013).

**Table 4** Comparison of the total condensed area for selected taxa in the management data (MD) and the systematic data (SD)

Taxa	Mapping units (n)	Data-set	Total condensed Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	Mean (km <sup>2</sup> )	Median (km <sup>2</sup> )	Z	P	R
All taxa	295	MD	28.44	9.64	4.26	– 14.711	< 0.001	0.606
		SD	2.43	0.82	0.13			
<i>Acacia cyclops</i>	295	MD	8.94	3.03	1.78	– 14.504	< 0.001	0.597
		SD	0.32	0.11	0.02			
<i>Acacia longifolia</i>	295	MD	3.19	1.08	0.00	– 6.964	< 0.001	0.287
		SD	0.52	0.17	0.00			
<i>Acacia saligna</i>	295	MD	10.78	3.65	0.71	– 13.204	< 0.001	0.544
		SD	1.36	0.46	0.02			
<i>Eucalyptus</i> spp.	295	MD	1.06	0.36	0.00	– 3.437	< 0.001	0.141
		SD	0.02	0.01	0.00			
<i>Hakea</i> spp.	295	MD	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.00	– 4.521	< 0.001	0.186
		SD	0.02	0.01	0.00			
<i>Leptospermum laevigatum</i>	295	MD	0.44	0.15	0.00	– 4.616	< 0.001	0.190
		SD	0.07	0.02	0.00			
<i>Paraserianthes lophantha</i>	295	MD	0.80	0.27	0.00	– 6.228	< 0.001	0.256
		SD	0.08	0.03	0.00			
<i>Pinus</i> spp.	295	MD	3.24	1.10	0.00	– 7.962	< 0.001	0.328
		SD	0.06	0.02	0.00			


All differences are significant

The similarity in the species and their abundance collected by PA managers and WfW project managers is not unexpected. The WfW programme prioritises the control of the most abundant, widespread and thus visible species in the PA, which would also be known to the PA managers. However, the long-term success in controlling or eradicating invasive plant species requires an integrated approach (Foxcroft and McGeoch 2011). This includes prevention, early detection and rapid response being implemented in conjunction with on-going control efforts to enable a cost-effective and long-term viable approach (Hulme 2006; Simberloff 2009; Tu 2009; van Wilgen et al. 2011). Investing in fine scale and accurate data on alien species within PA's would inform all of these objectives. However, PA managers often prefer experience-based information for decision making (Cook et al. 2009; Pullin et al. 2004), and even when presented with evidence-based data are reluctant to alter their decisions (McConnachie and Cowling 2013). The inherently social context of the PA decision making environment (including PA policies,

management structure, stakeholder base, priorities and capacity) is one of the main reasons given for not implementing evidence-based actions (Ntshotsho et al. 2015). In addition, the over-prediction of species presence in control programme plans may appear beneficial to a risk averse manager, who perceives inclusion of false presences as preferable to missing invasion sites (false absences), though we show the latter also has associated risks. Shortfalls in the current PA manager and WfW datasets and their consequences for effective and efficient alien management are discussed below.

#### Incomplete species lists

Large scale alien control programmes typically target common species due to information available to inform programme development and control plans. Incomplete alien plant species lists however, may result in less common species being undetected within a PA (McGeoch et al. 2012), losing opportunities for eradication of small populations before they become



**Fig. 4** Total condensed area (km<sup>2</sup>) for taxa in the Management (MD), Working for Water (WfW) and Systematic (SD) datasets where (α) indicates a significant difference between the

Systematic data and the Management data ( $p < 0.01$ ; Table 4) and (φ) a significant difference between the Systematic data and the WfW data ( $p < 0.01$ ; Table 5)

widespread (Leung et al. 2002; Rejmánek and Pitcairn 2002). For example, the systematic sampling detected *Callistemon salignus* (white bottlebrush) and *Centranthus ruber* (red valerian) at a few sites, totalling around 0.01 km<sup>2</sup> that could be targeted for eradication. As urban development and human populations increase around parks, adding to the pathways for alien species, the importance of accurate alien species listing is heightened (Alston and Richardson 2006; Spear et al. 2013). The systematic sampling recorded nine species of ornamental garden plants occurring in the PA, along its urban boundary, that were not listed in the WfW or PA managers datasets (Supplementary Material 2). Species accumulation curves indicate that there are likely even more species than indicated by the systematic sample (no asymptote reached, Fig. 3), highlighting the need for continued systematic monitoring to detect new invasions. In contrast, both management datasets reached their total species complement after inclusion of few sites (Fig. 3), indicating poor ability to identify rarer species.

Complete species lists are also important to enable prioritisation and risk assessment (McGeoch et al. 2012). Currently the data from the PA managers or

WfW cannot be scaled up to the organisational level to accurately inform national and international indicators relating to species richness and rates of new species arrival. This results in a missed opportunity that the WfW project can play in the global management of alien species and responses to national and global targets (McGeoch et al. 2010). Due to the strength of the systematic sampling approach, the Systematic data can readily be integrated with existing alien species lists at a national and international level (Foxcroft et al. 2017; Spear et al. 2011).


#### Species distribution and grain of data collection

Common pitfalls of control programmes include the ability to adequately detect target species prior to treatment and the lack of detection when re-infestation of the treated area from adjacent non-treated areas occurs (Rejmánek and Pitcairn 2002). The coarse grain of the Management and WfW data that are currently used in the PA's alien plant control programme suffer from both these deficiencies. Inadequate detection of the spread of a species across the PA in these management datasets means that new or

**Table 5** Comparison of the total condensed area for selected taxa in the WfW dataset (WfW) and systematic data (SD)

Taxa	Mapping units (n)	Data-set	Total condensed area (km <sup>2</sup> )	Mean (km <sup>2</sup> )	Median (km <sup>2</sup> )	Z	P	R
<b>All taxa</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>WfW</b>	<b>15.83</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>− 9.622</b>	<b>&lt; 0.001</b>	<b>0.513</b>
		SD	2.43	1.38	0.56			
<b><i>Acacia cyclops</i></b>	<b>176</b>	<b>WfW</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>− 4.882</b>	<b>&lt; 0.001</b>	<b>0.260</b>
		SD	0.32	0.18	0.02			
<i>Acacia longifolia</i>	176	WfW	0.54	0.30	0.00	− 0.822	0.411	0.044
		SD	0.52	0.29	0.00			
<b><i>Acacia saligna</i></b>	<b>176</b>	<b>WfW</b>	<b>12.85</b>	<b>7.30</b>	<b>2.24</b>	<b>− 9.495</b>	<b>&lt; 0.001</b>	<b>0.506</b>
		SD	1.36	0.77	0.10			
<i>Eucalyptus</i> spp.	176	WfW	0.18	0.10	0.00	− 0.191	0.848	0.010
		SD	0.02	0.01	0.00			
<b><i>Hakea</i> spp.</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>WfW</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>− 2.940</b>	<b>&lt; 0.01</b>	<b>0.157</b>
		SD	0.02	0.01	0.00			
<i>Leptospermum laevigatum</i>	176	WfW	0.11	0.06	0.00	− 1.213	0.225	0.065
		SD	0.07	0.04	0.00			
<i>Paraserianthes lophantha</i>	176	WfW	0.08	0.04	0.00	− 1.344	0.179	0.072
		SD	0.08	0.04	0.00			
<b><i>Pinus</i> spp.</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>WfW</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>− 3.643</b>	<b>&lt; 0.001</b>	<b>0.194</b>
		SD	0.06	0.03	0.00			

Species where significant differences were detected are indicated in bold



**Fig. 5** Calculated total clearing cost from the Systematic data and **a** the Management data and **b** the Working for Water (WfW) data. At-All selected taxa (combined); Ac-*Acacia cyclops*; Al-

*Acacia longifolia*; As-*Acacia saligna*; Es-*Eucalyptus* spp.; Hs-*Hakea* spp.; Ll-*Leptospermum laevigatum*; Pl-*Paraserianthes lophantha*; Ps-*Pinus* spp



expanding populations will go undetected. For example, the systematic sampling recorded 41 additional sites for *A. longifolia* where the species had not historically been recorded. Coarse (large) grained data tended to overestimate the occupancy of taxa in this study. Consistent over-estimation of occurrence of widespread species such as *A. cyclops* and *A. saligna* in the management datasets can result in overstating the core invaded area while inadequately delineating outlying satellite areas (He and Gaston 2000; McGeoch and Gaston 2002). Data used by WfW and PA managers to direct the control of alien invasive plants therefore cannot be used to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of control within monitoring frameworks, for example the Thresholds of Potential Concern Adaptive Management framework (Foxcroft 2009).

#### Inaccuracy in estimation of species abundance

Measures of abundance (number of individual plants per unit area) are important for developing and monitoring the strategic goals of invasive plant control programmes through understanding the nature and scope of management interventions relative to the impact that the species will have (Latombe et al. 2016). In particular, WfW funding is allocated to areas in relation to WfW-estimated alien density data, and until funds are exhausted. This use of funds, in combination with inaccurate data, means that funding may be exhausted before the real priorities have been allocated sufficient funding. For example *A. longifolia* was found to occur in 61 more management units than recorded in the WfW dataset (Table 3), meaning these areas would not have been allocated sufficient funding. Key actions recommended for alien plant control programmes include (1) reducing the residency time of new invaders, (2) identifying, and focusing on areas of high propagule pressure and (3) maintaining or locally eradicating invaders from lightly invaded areas (Tu 2009). Due to the incorrect abundance estimates in the WfW and Management data, inefficient application of control methods, and improper prioritisation of target areas, misallocation of resources can be expected. The substantial overestimate of costs resulting from WfW data, when compared to systematic sampling data, illustrates the potential extent of the problem. One might expect that a risk adverse approach of overestimating the workload would

ensure that areas are completely cleared of alien species. However, the project area still has a wide occurrence of alien species present which means that the currently inflated budget maybe obscuring the appropriate or more effective control methodologies. The misalignment of resource allocation can have long-term negative implications for a control programme where budgets and resources are often limited (Krug et al. 2010; Moore et al. 2011).

#### Benefits of systematic sampling

In managing alien control programmes there is often a budget trade-off between funds available for field sampling and control operations, with intensive sampling being avoided due to the time constraints, costs, and resources required (Hauser and McCarthy 2009). While a variety of invasive alien plant surveys are warranted depending on the management objectives (Dewey and Andersen 2004), survey approaches for alien plant programmes covering large areas should emphasise accurate, consistent and repeatable methodologies (McNaught et al. 2008). Currently both the WfW and PA managers approaches fall short of these requirements and produce a skewed picture of the clearing effort and resources required. The poor distribution and abundance records from the WfW and PA manager data commits funding to low priority areas, resulting in inefficient spending. This limits opportunities to expand clearing to additional species, areas, early detection and rapid response (EDRR) programmes and ironically the monitoring that would enable this. Candidate EDRR not recorded by managers in this study would include for example *Acacia pycnantha*, *Centranthus ruber* and *Callistemon salignus*. Using the systematic data it would be possible to cover more management units per year, potentially enabling the achievement of a long-term management goal where every area is treated at least once in a two year cycle. This goal was not being achieved using the management data described.

In addition to the systematic sampling addressing shortfalls in accuracy, this approach enables comparisons to be made across time and as needed through repeated data collection. This will allow for better understanding and management of alien plant species, as the systematic sampling accurately determines where alien plant species are not present in the PA, either through successful control over time or delineation of

areas that have not yet been invaded. The systematic mapping exercise cost approximately ZAR100,000 (< 0.1% of the control budget at the time, although this could increase in areas of higher alien density and more mountainous terrain). We propose that when viewed in comparison with the potential budget savings enabled by more accurate plans, the systematic sampling approach is a cost effective addition to the current management approach, providing data that can readily feed into local, national and international monitoring programmes.

## Conclusion

Differences in alien species datasets are expected due to differences in the purpose for and scales at which data are collected. However, as we illustrate here, the urgency of required management actions often results in implementation prior to gaining a full understanding of the problem. Our systematic sampling provided estimates of species richness and abundance that differed by orders of magnitude from the data that are used to make management decisions. While managers may perceive the time and cost required to undertake detailed landscape-scale surveys as wasteful when something could be done about the problem in the interim, we argue that properly assessing the true scope of the problem is critical to optimizing the impact of control work and outputs for budgets spent. Fine-scale alien plant surveys can be used to establish baseline alien plant species information that is suitable for implementing long-term monitoring programmes to assess change as a result of management interventions and environmental factors. This would overcome the current situation where existing management datasets do not allow for the determination of the source, extent, dynamics and realistic clearing costs of alien plants.

**Acknowledgements** Thanks to Leandri Gerber, Khanyisa Tyolo and Richardt Smith who undertook the infield mapping. The following funders and grants are acknowledged: The Table Mountain Fund and the AW Mellon Foundation (CC and infield work), South African National Parks (CC, LCF, NvW), the DST-NRF Centre of Excellence for Invasion Biology (KJE, LCF, NvW), Stellenbosch University (CC, KJE, LCF), the National Research Foundation of South Africa (LCF: Project Numbers IFR2010041400019 and IFR160215158271, KJE: Grant number 103841) and the Australian Research Council (MM: Grant DP150103017). We thank two anonymous

reviewers for their constructive comments that helped improve the article.

## References

- Alba C, Skálová H, McGregor KF, D'Antonio C, Pyšek P (2015) Native and exotic plant species respond differently to wildfire and prescribed fire as revealed by meta-analysis. *J Veg Sci* 26:102–113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12212>
- Allouche O, Tsoar A, Kadmon R (2006) Assessing the accuracy of species distribution models: prevalence, kappa and the true skill statistic (TSS). *J Appl Ecol* 43:1223–1232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01214.x>
- Alston KP, Richardson DM (2006) The roles of habitat features, disturbance, and distance from putative source populations in structuring alien plant invasions at the urban/wildland interface on the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *Biol Conserv* 132:183–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.03.023>
- Barr LM, Watson JEM, Possingham HP, Iwamura T, Fuller RA (2016) Progress in improving the protection of species and habitats in Australia. *Biol Conserv* 200:184–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.03.038>
- Biggs HC, Rogers KH (2003) An adaptive system to link science, monitoring and management in practice. In: du Toit JT, Rogers KH, Biggs HC (eds) *The Kruger experience: ecology and management of savanna heterogeneity*. Island Press, Washington DC, pp 59–80
- Brooks ML et al (2004) Effects of invasive alien plants on fire regimes. *Bioscience* 54:677–688
- Colwell RK (2013) EstimateS: statistical estimation of species richness and shared species from samples, version 9.1. <http://viceroy.eeb.uconn.edu/estimates/>. Accessed 13 June 2017
- Cook CN, Hockings M, Carter RW (2009) Conservation in the dark? The information used to support management decisions. *Front Ecol Environ* 8:181–186. <https://doi.org/10.1890/090020>
- Cowling RM, MacDonald IAW, Simmons MT (1996) The Cape Peninsula, South Africa: physiographical, biological and historical background to an extraordinary hot-spot of biodiversity. *Biodivers Conserv* 5:527–550. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00137608>
- Dewey SA, Andersen KA (2004) Distinct roles of surveys, inventories, and monitoring in adaptive weed management. *Weed Technol* 18:1449–1452. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3989669>
- Donlan CJ, Luque GM, Wilcox C (2015) Maximizing return on investment for island restoration and species conservation. *Conserv Lett* 8:171–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12126>
- Dudley N, Parish J (2006) Closing the gap. Creating ecologically representative protected area systems: a guide to conducting the gap assessments of protected area systems for the convention on biological diversity. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, Technical Series no. 24, vi + 108 pages
- Ehrenfeld JG (2010) Ecosystem consequences of biological invasions. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 41:59–80. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102209-144650>

- ESRI (Environmental Systems Research Institute) (2014) Arc-GIS Release 10.1-3. Redlands, CA
- Fielding A (2007) Cluster and classification techniques for the biosciences, vol 570.15195 F5. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Fielding AH, Bell JF (1997) A review of methods for the assessment of prediction errors in conservation presence/absence models. *Environ Conserv* 24:38–49
- Foxcroft LC (2009) Developing thresholds of potential concern for invasive alien species: hypotheses and concepts. *Koedoe*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/koedoe.v51i1.157>
- Foxcroft LC, McGeoch M (2011) Implementing invasive species management in an adaptive management framework. *Koedoe*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/koedoe.v53i2.1006>
- Foxcroft LC, Richardson DM, Wilson JR (2008) Ornamental plants as invasive aliens: problems and solutions in Kruger National Park, South Africa. *Environ Manag* 41:32–51
- Foxcroft LC, Richardson DM, Rouget M, MacFadyen S (2009) Patterns of alien plant distribution at multiple spatial scales in a large national park: implications for ecology, management and monitoring. *Divers Distrib* 15:367–378. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2008.00544.x>
- Foxcroft LC, Pyšek P, Richardson DM, Pergl J, Hulme PE (2013a) The bottom line: impacts of alien plant invasions in protected areas. In: Foxcroft LC, Pyšek P, Richardson DM, Genovesi P (eds) *Plant invasions in protected areas*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp 19–41
- Foxcroft LC, Richardson DM, Pyšek P, Genovesi P (2013b) Plant invasions in protected areas: outlining the issues and creating the links. In: Foxcroft LC, Pyšek P, Richardson DM, Genovesi P (eds) *Plant invasions in protected areas*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp 3–18. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7750-7\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7750-7_1)
- Foxcroft LC, van Wilgen NJ, Baard JA, Cole NS (2017) Biological invasions in South African National Parks. *Bothalia Afr Biodivers Conserv* 47:1–12
- Gardener MR, Atkinson R, Rentería JL (2010) Eradications and people: lessons from the plant eradication program in Galapagos restoration. *Ecology* 18:20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2009.00614.x>
- Hauser CE, McCarthy MA (2009) Streamlining ‘search and destroy’: cost-effective surveillance for invasive species management. *Ecol Lett* 12:683–692
- He FL, Gaston KJ (2000) Occupancy-abundance relationships and sampling scales. *Ecography* 23:503–511. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0587.2000.230412.x>
- Helme NA, Trinder-Smith TH (2006) The endemic flora of the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *S Afr J Bot* 72:205–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sajb.2005.07.004>
- Holmes PM, Cowling RM (1997) The effects of invasion by *Acacia saligna* on the guild structure and regeneration capabilities of South African fynbos shrublands. *J Appl Ecol* 34:317–332. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2404879>
- Hulme PE (2006) Beyond control: wider implications for the management of biological invasions. *J Appl Ecol* 43:835–847. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01227.x>
- Kettenring KM, Adams CR (2011) Lessons learned from invasive plant control experiments: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Appl Ecol* 48:970–979. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.01979.x>
- Kotzé I, Beukes H, Van den Berg E, Newby T (2010) National invasive alien plant survey. Agricultural Research Council, Institute for Soil, Climate and Water, Report No GW/A/2010/21
- Krug R, Roura-Pascual N, Richardson D (2010) Clearing of invasive alien plants under different budget scenarios: using a simulation model to test efficiency. *Biol Invasions* 12:4099–4112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-010-9827-3>
- Kueffer C et al (2013) Plant invasions into mountain protected areas: assessment, prevention and control at multiple spatial scales. In: Foxcroft LC, Pyšek P, Richardson DM, Genovesi P (eds) *Plant Invasions in Protected Areas*, vol 7. *Invading Nature—Springer Series in Invasion Ecology*. Springer, Netherlands, pp 89–113
- Landis JR, Koch GG (1977) The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics* 33:159–174
- Latombe G, Pyšek P, Jeschke JM, Blackburn TM, Bacher S, Capinha C, Costello MJ, Fernández M, Gregory RD, Hobern D, Hui C, Jetz W, Kumschick S, McGrannachan C, Pergl J, Roy HE, Scalera R, Squires ZE, Wilson JR, Winter M, Genovesi P, McGeoch MA (2016) A vision for global monitoring of biological invasions. *Biol Cons* 213:295–308
- Le Maitre DC, Versfeld DB (1994) Field manual for mapping populations of invasive plants for use with the catchment management system. Department of Environment Affairs, Pretoria
- Le Maitre DC, van Wilgen BW, Gelderblom C, Bailey C, Chapman RA, Nel J (2002) Invasive alien trees and water resources in South Africa: case studies of the costs and benefits of management. *For Ecol Manag* 160:143–159
- Le Maitre DC, Richardson DM, Chapman RA (2004) Alien plant invasions in South Africa: driving forces and the human dimension: working for water. *S Afr J Sci* 100:103–112
- Leung B, Lodge DM, Finnoff D, Jason FS, Lewis MA, Lamberti G (2002) An ounce of prevention or a pound of cure: bioeconomic risk analysis of invasive species. *Proc Biol Sci* 269:2407–2413. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3558671>
- Macdonald IAW, Jarman L, Beeston P (1985) Management of invasive alien plants in the fynbos biome. Foundation for Research Development, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
- Marais C, Wannenburgh A (2008) Restoration of water resources (natural capital) through the clearing of invasive alien plants from riparian areas in South Africa—costs and water benefits. *S Afr J Bot* 74:526–537
- McConnachie MM, Cowling RM (2013) On the accuracy of conservation managers’ beliefs and if they learn from evidence-based knowledge: a preliminary investigation. *J Environ Manag* 128:7–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.04.021>
- McConnachie MM, Cowling RM, van Wilgen BW, McConnachie DA (2012) Evaluating the cost-effectiveness of invasive alien plant clearing: a case study from South Africa. *Biol Conserv* 155:128–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2012.06.006>
- McGeoch MA, Gaston KJ (2002) Occupancy frequency distributions: patterns, artefacts and mechanisms. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc* 77:311–331
- McGeoch MA et al (2010) Global indicators of biological invasion: species numbers, biodiversity impact and policy

- responses. *Divers Distrib* 16:95–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2009.00633.x>
- McGeoch MA, Spear D, Kleyhans EJ, Marais E (2012) Uncertainty in invasive alien species listing. *Ecol Appl* 22:959–971. <https://doi.org/10.1890/11-1252.1>
- McNaught I, Thackway R, Brown L, Parsons M (2008) A field manual for surveying and mapping nationally significant weeds, 2nd edn. Commonwealth Government-Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry-Bureau of Rural Sciences
- Moore JL, Runge MC, Webber BL, Wilson JR (2011) Contain or eradicate? Optimizing the management goal for Australian acacia invasions in the face of uncertainty. *Divers Distrib* 17:1047–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2011.00809.x>
- Neethling H, Shuttleworth B (2013) Revision of the Working for Water workload norms. Forestry Solutions, White River, South Africa
- Nel J et al (2004) A proposed classification of invasive alien plant species in South Africa: towards prioritizing species and areas for management action: working for water. *S Afr J Sci* 100:53–64
- Ntshotsho P, Prozesky HE, Esler KJ, Reyers B (2015) What drives the use of scientific evidence in decision making? The case of the South African working for water program. *Biol Conserv* 184:136–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.01.021>
- Pressey RL, Visconti P, Ferraro PJ (2015) Making parks make a difference: poor alignment of policy, planning and management with protected-area impact, and ways forward. *Phil Trans R Soc B* 370:20140280
- Pullin AS, Knight TM, Stone DA, Charman K (2004) Do conservation managers use scientific evidence to support their decision-making? *Biol Conserv* 119:245–252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2003.11.007>
- Pyšek P, Richardson DM (2010) Invasive species, environmental change and management, and health. *Annu Rev Environ Resour* 35:25–55. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-033009-095548>
- Rejmánek M, Pyšek P (2002) When is eradication of exotic pest plants a realistic goal? In: Veitch CR, Clout MN (eds) *Turning the tide: the eradication of invasive species*. IUCN, Gland, pp 249–253
- Rew LJ, Pokorny ML (eds) (2006) Inventory and survey methods for nonindigenous plant species. Monana State University Extensions, Bozeman, MT
- Roura-Pascual N et al (2009) Ecology and management of alien plant invasions in South African fynbos: accommodating key complexities in objective decision making. *Biol Conserv* 142:1595–1604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.02.029>
- Roura-Pascual N, Richardson D, Arthur Chapman R, Hichert T, Krug R (2011) Managing biological invasions: charting courses to desirable futures in the Cape Floristic Region. *Reg Environ Change* 11:311–320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-010-0133-5>
- Shaughnessy GL (1980) Historical ecology of alien woody plants in the vicinity of Cape Town, South Africa. Doctoral dissertation, University of Cape Town
- Simberloff D (2009) We can eliminate invasions or live with them. Successful management projects. *Biol Invasions* 11:149–157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-008-9317-z>
- Spear D, McGeoch MA, Foxcroft LC, Bezuidenhout H (2011) Alien species in South Africa's national parks. *Koedoe*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/koedoe.v53i1.1032>
- Spear D, Foxcroft LC, Bezuidenhout H, McGeoch MA (2013) Human population density explains alien species richness in protected areas. *Biol Conserv* 159:137–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2012.11.022>
- Statistics South Africa (2011) Census 2011 Municipal report—Western Cape, Pretoria
- Taylor HC, Macdonald SA (1985) Invasive alien woody plants in the Cape of Good Hope nature reserve. I. Results of a first survey in 1966. *S Afr J Bot* 51:14–20
- Taylor HC, Macdonald SA, Macdonald IAW (1985) Invasive alien woody plants in the Cape of Good Hope nature reserve. II. Results of a second survey from 1976–1980. *S Afr J Bot* 51:21–29
- Tu M (2009) Assessing and Managing Invasive Species within Protected Areas. Protected Area Quick Guide Series, The Nature Conservancy
- van Wilgen BW et al (2011) National-scale strategic approaches for managing introduced plants: insights from Australian acacias in South Africa. *Divers Distrib* 17:1060–1075. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2011.00785.x>
- van Wilgen BW, Cowling RM, Marais C, Esler KJ, McConachie M, Sharp D (2012a) Challenges in invasive alien plant control in South Africa. *S Afr J Sci* 108:5–7. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajs.v108i11/12.1445>
- van Wilgen BW, Forsyth GG, Le Maitre DC, Wannenburgh A, Kotzé JDF, van den Berg E, Henderson L (2012b) An assessment of the effectiveness of a large, national-scale invasive alien plant control strategy in South Africa. *Biol Conserv* 148:28–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.12.035>
- van Wilgen BW, Fill JM, Baard J, Cheney C, Forsyth AT, Kraaij T (2016) Historical costs and projected future scenarios for the management of invasive alien plants in protected areas in the Cape Floristic Region. *Biol Conserv* 200:168–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.06.008>
- Watson JEM, Dudley N, Segan DB, Hockings M (2014) The performance and potential of protected areas. *Nature* 515:67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13947>
- Wilson JR, Ivey P, Manyama P, Nänni I (2013) A new national unit for invasive species detection, assessment and eradication planning. *S Afr J Sci* 109:01–13
- Wittenberg R, Cock MJW (2001) Invasive alien species: a toolkit of best prevention and management practices. CAB International, Wallingford
- Working for Water (2013) Annual Plan of Operation, Table Mountain National Park, Project: TMNP-South